

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 10-12, 16, 17, 32-39 and 42-60 are pending in the application. Claims 47-60 are allowed. Claims 1-3, 10-12, 16, 17, 32-39 and 42-46 stand rejected. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks herein.

Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during a telephonic interview on August 7, 2009, which included discussion of possible clarifications of the rejection under 35 USC § 112.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-3, 10-12, 16-17, 32-39 and 42-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Examiner states “claim 1 is indefinite because it is not clear how the resin film comprises a vapor barrier. It is not clear if the resin film is a vapor barrier film or merely provided vapor barrier properties.” This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants amend claim 1 to clarify that the vapor barrier can be a coating or resin film as explained in the Specification:

[0071] The paper side of either composite may also include a resin film or coating, such as of polyethylene, to serve as a vapor barrier or heat seal in use.

The coating can be provided on the paper prior to lamination to the fastener component of the composite, or applied later. In the case of the hook-paper laminate, the hook resin can extend in a solid film across the width of the composite to serve as a vapor barrier. Alternatively, the hooks and base can be molded in strips extending along the back of the paper, with exposed paper between the strips. The paper coating may be incompatible with the resin of which the hooks are being formed. For instance, a polyethylene coated or

laminated film may be pre-applied to the paper to provide moisture resistance to the backside of the product, and provide a desired vapor barrier. (page 15).

Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections under Section 112 and reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for recognizing the allowable subject matter of each of claims 47-60 and of claims 1-3, 10-12, 16-17, 32-39 and 42-46 notwithstanding the Section 112 second paragraph rejection addressed above.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reason for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to amendment. Applicants respectfully request consideration of all filed IDS' not previously considered, by initialing and returning each Form 1449.

The undersigned attorney welcomes the opportunity to further discuss by telephone any position or issue not fully addressed by the above remarks and amendments.

All extension fees are being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply all charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 05918-0336US1.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/7/2009

/Kirk Dorius/

Kirk Dorius
Reg. No. 54,073

Fish & Richardson P.C.
One Congress Plaza, Suite 810
111 Congress Avenue
Austin, TX 78701
Telephone: (512) 472-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945